DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 374 CE 043 349

AUTHOR Solomon, Janet Stern
TITLE Re-employment for Dislocated Workers: The Jobs Training Partnership Act Experience in Maryland.
PUB DATE [85]
NOTE 31p.; Document contains light type.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; Cooperative Planning; Cooperative Programs; Coordination; *Dislocated Workers; Educational Cooperation; *Employment Programs; Federal Legislation; Financial Support; Job Placement; Participant Characteristics; Postsecondary Education; Program Content; Program Effectiveness; *Retraining; *School Business Relationship; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *Job Training Partnership Act 1982; *Maryland; Reemployment

ABSTRACT

A study examined the effectiveness of Title III of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) in providing employment and training assistance for dislocated workers in Maryland. Four areas--participants, program content, funding, and performance--were assessed. Despite its imperfections, JTPA seemed to do a good job of establishing a partnership of public agencies, employers, and labor representatives. More reemployment training than occupational skills training was being conducted under Title III, and eligible candidates were choosing immediate reemployment rather than 6 to 12 months of skills training, even though this frequently meant making transitions from manufacturing jobs with generous compensation packages to service sector jobs with low wages and limited benefits. It was concluded that deleting the currently existing restriction against receiving unemployment benefits while participating in JTPA-funded retraining could enable far more trainees to afford the longer-term solution than is now the case. If success is defined as placements into unsubsidized employment, the Maryland program has certainly been successful. Of the 761 persons who terminated their participation in JTPA-funded reemployment training in fiscal year 1984, 502 (66 percent) reported entering unsubsidized employment. The JTPA performance orientation seems to result in higher unsubsidized employment rates than did the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA), although CETA did not maintain separate records for dislocated workers. (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED265374

RE-EMPLOYMENT FOR DISLOCATED WORKERS:

THE JOBS TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT EXPERIENCE IN MARYLAND

JANET STERN SOLOMON
Associate Professor of Business
Towson State University
202-362-2346
301-321-4106

Fall 1985

The support of the Towson State University Faculty Research Committee is gratefully acknowledged.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Janet Stern Solomon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE043345

BIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT

Janet Stern Solomon is associate professor of business administration at Towson State University in Towson, Marvland. She has previous y authored articles in employment and training policy.

RE-EMPLOYMENT FOR DISLOCATED WORKERS:

THE JOBS TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT EXPERIENCE IN MARYLAND

ABSTRACT

Currently the Jobs Training Partnership Act (JTPA) of 1982, specifically Title III, is the only Federal program designed to assist dislocated workers. Using Maryland, a state sharing many of the characteristics of Ohio, Michigan and other northern states suffering declines in traditional industries, this article assesses the effectiveness of the JTPA approach to structural unemployment. Four areas, participants, program content, funding, and performance, are discussed first from the national level, then Maryland's experience, and finally the effectiveness of each is assessed. Performance, the actual placements of the participants, merits the closest scrutiny. Despite some imperfections, the public-private sector partnership philosophy works well in Maryland and provides a good return for the employment and training investment.

RE-EMPLOYMENT FOR DISLOCATED WORKERS:
THE JOBS TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT EXPERIENCE IN MARYLAND

INTRODUCTION

Despite over 50 years of Federal attempts to reduce unemployment, large numbers of people remain desperate for an opportunity to work. Unemployment is a complex issue, with diverse causes and necessarily diverse solutions. One aspect of the problem, structural unemployment, arises from basic changes in the balance between the supply of workers existing from past labor conditions and the demand for workers in current labor markets. Employment in such industries as steel and auto manufacturing collapses in the face of foreign competition and technological advances, leaving enormous gaps for former employees. Their skills are no longer marketable. At the same time, new industries requiring different skills emerge. The issue today is to prepare yesterday's workers for tomorrow's jobs.

Currently there is only one Federal program aimed specifically at these displaced or dislocated workers, the Jobs Training Partnership Act (JTPA) of 1982. Using Maryland, a state sharing many of the characteristics of Ohio, Michigan and other northern states suffering declines in their traditional industries, this article seeks to assess the effectiveness of the JTPA approach to structural unemployment. Although there has been little more than a year's experience, the "partnership" philosophy between the public and private sectors is working well in Maryland and provides insight for other states.

BACKGROUND OF EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING LEGISLATION

Since the Depression years, the Federal government has attempted to develop employment opportunities by influencing the supply of jobs as well as available workers' skills. The first post-war Federal employment and training effort, the Area Redevelopment Act (ARA) of 1961, sought to attract new businesses to economically depressed areas and to provide a limited amount of training to provide the necessary skilled workforce from a disadvantaged pool.(1)

In 1962 the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) replaced the training provisions of the ARA, providing a broader range of training services and allowances. Initially MDTA training and other assistance programs were intended for experienced coal miners, steelworkers and factory workers being replaced by automation, but once underway, the need for those who had no skills or work experience became evident.(2) Since then separate training programs have existed for those with previously stable employment patterns (the "dislocated" or "displaced workers") and those with no experience (the "disadvantaged workers").

Following 1964, the year President Johnson declared the "War on Poverty", government undertook huge job training programs for the disadvantaged while skilled workers enjoyed low unemployment rates. In 1973, the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) was enacted to coordinate the proliferation of programs of the previous ten years, but by the late 1970s, CETA's inability to serve the growing need of the displaced workers was evident.(3) The Trade Act of 1974, including

the Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program, provided assistance to workers displaced by foreign competition, particularly in the steel and auto industries.(4)

In 1983 CETA was replaced by the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). The new law was based on the concept of private industry involvement in planning and administering job training programs, which had been established in Title VII of CETA. Title VII included the Private Sector Initiatives Program (PSIP), which had the authority to plan the spending of Title VII funds.(5)

Private sector participation in job training programs through Private Industry Councils (PICs) is a vital element of the JTPA. Although public policy is considered by some observers to be the answer to unemployment issues, the involvement of private industry is acknowledged to be crucial to any effective program.(6)

> "No one can seriously question the proposition that the efforts of business have been of central importance in the education and development of the American work force. The American Society for Training and Development estimates that corporations spend $20 billion a year on in-house training, and it is clear that more and more firms are recognizing that it is not in their long-term interest to treat direct labor as a short-term variable cost."(7)

Our experience in the Kennedy years and more recently the 1980s has shown that private industry will not train the displaced workers on their own. The late 1960s and 1970s showed us that the public sector cannot solve the problem alone. The JTPA attempts to join the efforts of both sectors for a better solution.

THE JTPA APPROACH

The objective of the JTPA is to provide people with the skills

and other assistance necessary to enter into unsubsidized employment. Congress provided separate programs for the economically disadvantaged (Title II) and those workers displaced by economic, technological and industrial factors (Title III). Beyond this predictable separation, JTPA takes a different approach than CETA and other previous employment and training legislation.

The JTPA programs are operated and controlled by state and local governments together with private industry, substantially limiting Federal activities. The Act requires oversight by a state coordinating council, whose members represent business and industry, state agencies, local government, organized labor, community-based organizations, local educational agencies, and other appropriate public interest groups. The Governor's Employment and Training Council (GETC) provides this function in Maryland.

Specific roles are identified for the major entities involved in employment and training services. State government performs three functions. It acts as overall coordinator and administrator of the employment and training system; second, it provides a public labor exchange through the State Job Service together with the Service Delivery Areas (SDAs); and third, it provides employment and training services when local agencies either choose not to deliver these services or are unable to provide them.

Local government, together with local Private Industry Councils, discussed below, are the primary providers of employment and training services within their jurisdiction. The private sector is involved in identifying employment and training needs, assisting with

the overall planning for the employment and training system, designing specific programs and, where appropriate, operating employment and training services.(8)

The private sector participates through the Private Industry Council (PIC) in each SDA. A majority of PIC members and the chairman must represent the private sector, nominated by local business organizations. The private sector members must represent the industry and demographic composition of the local business community, including small business and minority enterprises.(9) The remaining PIC members represent public agencies including local public education, community based organizations, and state and local economic development agencies.(10)

Each of Maryland's ten SDAs (Baltimore Metropolitan, Baltimore County, Frederick County, Lower Shore, Montgomery County, Prince George's County, Southern Maryland, Susquehanna Region, Upper Shore, and Western Maryland) assisted by the appropriate State agencies and its own PIC, must address the issues of access to jobs, educational and training opportunities, pertinent employment and training information, public assistance and other relevant opportunities.(11)

ASSESSMENT

The remainder of this article seeks to assess the effectiveness of Title III of the JTPA, Employment and Training Assistance for Dislocated Workers. The question at hand is: does this program work any better than what we have had in the past? Four areas, participants, program content, funding, and performance, are discussed first from the

national level of the Act, then Maryland's experience, and finally the effectiveness of each is assessed. Performance, the actual placements of the participants, merits the closest scrutiny.

The Participants

Candidates for the Title III program for dislocated workers must fit into one of three categories of eligibility:

1- People who have been terminated or laid-off from their job or who have been notified of pending lay-off, who are eligible to receive or have exhausted their unemployment benefits, and are unlikely to return to their previous industry or occupation.

2- People who have lost or are about to lose their job because of a permanent plant or facility closing.

3- The long-term unemployed who have limited opportunities in their industry or occupation in the region where they live, including older workers whose age creates a barrier to employment.(12)

The ten SDAs in Maryland have experienced varying levels of participation in Title III programs. The Baltimore Metropolitan and County SDAs and Western Maryland accounted for 89.5% of the State's total participants in Title III programs in FY 1984. These statistics reflect large scale layoffs at Bethlehem Steel's Sparrows' Point facility and the Broening Highway General Motors' plant, as well as the impending shutdown of the Baltimore area Western Electric plant. In Western Maryland the Fairchild and Celanese Corporations closed plants, while Mack Truck laid off 2000 employees.(13)

Demographically, Title III participants across the State are

mostly male (74%), high school graduates or equivalent (66%), and are racially balanced, although there are more blacks in the Baltimore area and substantially more whites in Western Maryland.(14) A special study profiling Maryland's dislocated workers concluded that the most distinguishing factor between successful and unsuccessful job seekers was age, with most successful workers being between 25 and 35 years of age. Factors such as level of education, years of residence in Maryland, race and marital status were not found to be significant to job search success. However all successful job seekers took substantial cuts in pay and were working fewer hours than in their previous jobs. They all anticipated training programs at the new job, which in all cases involved very different work than their previous occupation, although all successful job seekers in the study indicated that they had enjoyed their previous jobs.(15)

The statistics tell only part of the story. These people are leaving assembly and semi-skilled jobs in industries, where they earned $13 - $14 per hour up to $18 - $20 per hour on straight time, often working overtime at premium rates. They have stable employment histories, are often natives of their present community, have families, and have not previously received public assistance.(16) As trainees, they may not be receiving unemployment compensation while enrolled in a Title III program and are paid only minimal stipends during the training period.(17) Most have lost their health care coverage and therefore cannot afford the luxury of the time and lost income necessary for acquiring new skills. Financially they must seek employment.

More skills retraining could be accomplished if participation could begin before unemployment benefits are exhausted. The dislocated worker has typically not sought public solutions to his problems, but is highly motivated to return to self-sufficiency. Allowing training of workers who will never return to their previous occupations to begin while still receiving unemployment compensation could provide increased occupational training instead of job search training, as the following section will show is currently the case.

Program content.

Once the participant groups are identified, private industry and public agency representatives in the PIC of each area target the occupations for retraining and inform eligible workers about existing training opportunities.(18) While the JTPA emphasizes training for employment skills in short supply, training in job search techniques, relocation assistance, job development, support services, and early intervention in plant closing situations, are all authorized activities under the Act.(19) These activities stress re-employment, rather than skills training, and have become a major focus of Maryland's program.

Maryland has developed a variety of programs aimed at quickly placing participants back into the work force with whatever skills or aptitudes they already possess. Placement into positions which provide on the job training satisfy both the public sector's obligation and the individual's financial and psychological needs for self-sufficiency. Thus, many Title III participants receive training in resume writing, interview techniques, and job search strategies with the objective of

prompt re-employment. The Bradley Center in downtown Baltimore and the DEAP project in Baltimore County are examples of the re-employment training orientation, while the Eastside Occupational Training Center, also in Baltimore County, provides skills training as well as job search support.

The Bradley Worker Assistance Center, opened in January 1984, provides a variety of services including counseling, skills assessment, job search techniques, and developing job opportunities. The Center refers workers to either classroom occupational training programs, individual training slots at area community colleges and proprietary schools, or on-the-job training openings in private industry. It does no skills training at its own facility.

The Bradley Center's emphasis is on Renew, a project targeted to workers with five or more years of experience, using volunteer professionals from industry, labor unions and local government to assist participants in identifying their occupational skills, developing job search skills, and performing other activities aimed at re-employment. (20) Only about 20% of the approximately 125 clients taken in each month at this center are directed toward skills training.(21) Individuals are referred to proprietary schools for training in service jobs such as home repair, apartment maintenance, auto mechanics, and landscaping. Tuition payment to the training institution is dependent on placement of the client. If the trainee does not find employment, ideally utilizing the newly acquired skills, the school is not reimbursed. This obligation generates impressive placement results for the program.(22) While the Bradley Center integrates many necessary ser-

vices for the displaced worker, with 80% of its clients not directed to skills training, it is essentially a re-employment effort.

The Dislocated Employees Assistance Project (DEAP) in Baltimore County, also emphasizes re-employment with an individual's current abilities and interests. The DEAP program, operated by the AFL-CIO Appalachian Council, offers financial and employment counseling, assisting individuals in the psychological readjustment necessary to accept lower salaried positions. Occupational skills training is provided by community colleges and proprietary schools, with up to one year's tuition expenses reimbursed by public funds.

However, few DEAP participants elect skills training, choosing immediate re-employment assistance instead. The requirement that unemployment benefits be exhausted while receiving no more than $100 per week during the training period, make it extremely difficult to make the commitment necessary for skills training. Most participants choose to pursue immediate re-employment through job search activities.(23)

By contrast, Maryland's only facility dedicated to skills training, the Eastside Occupational Training Center (EOTC), is located not far away. In May 1983, Baltimore County opened this sophisticated training center in a vacated furniture store in Essex, Maryland, near aging Bethlehem Steel and General Motors plants. The training center designs a four stage program of assessment, orientation, training and marketing for each of its many former steel and auto worker clients.

The assessment phase identifies necessary basic skills, including academic skills remediation, transferable skills, hobbies,

interests and motivation. During this phase, "recall fantasy" (denial that the layoff is permanent), stress, anger and other emotions are confronted. The second stage includes a one week orientation of values, the training programs available, and provides a high school equivalency (GED) component, although the acceptance process eliminates many non-diploma holders.

In the third stage, the participant is ready to enter one of six skills training programs. Training is provided at the Center by Essex Community College in modern office technology (an updated secretarial program), electronics, and computer aided drafting; and by Dundalk Community College in accounting, computer programming, and modern maintenance technology (heating, air conditioning, etc.). Together with a counselor, each participant first identifies an interest area and then sets detailed performance objectives with time frames. After the individuals' competencies are assessed, separate training modules are assigned by a training counselor. Learning is the individual's responsibility and most are highly motivated to succeed and graduate to paid emploment. Like the Bradley and DEAP clients, those at the Eastside facility have exhausted their unemployment benefits and receive no more than $100 per week.

When a sufficient skills level to qualify for an entry level job in the occupation has been reached, the Eastside trainee is deemed "job ready" and graduates to the fourth and final stage of the program. This marketing phase includes resume writing, interviewing and job search techniques. This type of support continues for a maximum of 90 days, during which time most people are placed. Although the entire

four stage program is self-paced, the average time for completion is five months. (24)

The Eastside Center is the only training facility in Maryland designed to provide skills training for displaced workers, although there are also some disadvantaged workers there. While it is too early for a final judgment, it seems inappropriate for other areas of Marvland, which have periodic needs, but insufficient demand to sustain such a facility. Where there are fewer displaced workers and fewer crisis situations, it is more efficient to allocate resources to a particular situation, such as was done in Western Maryland for the Fairchild and Celanese plant closings. A training facility like the Eastside Center, requires substantial financial and human resources, which SDAs with fewer dislocated workers and smaller budgets cannot commit.

However, for states with high concentrations of displaced workers the Eastside Center provides an impressive prototype. The location of the Center in Baltimore County, relatively convenient to much of the rest of the state, is prompting some cooperation with other SDAs with smaller numbers of candidates. The Susquehanna SDA is considering an arrangement to purchase training slots at the Essex facility later in 1985 and other areas may follow. While the overhead necessary to maintain such a facility is high, it can and should be amortized over as large a number of participants as possible.

Funding

Of the Federal funds budgeted for Title III programs for dislocated workers, 75% are allocated to the states based equally on the following factors: (1) the relative number of unemployed individuals; (2) the relative number of unemployed individuals in excess of 4.5% of the civilian labor force; and (3) the relative number of people unemployed 15 weeks or longer. The remaining 25% of Federal funds are awarded nationwide at the discretion of the Secretary of Labor, on a competitive basis, for special situations such as mass layoffs, natural disasters, and Federal Government facility relocations having major impact on regional unemployment.(25)

At the Governor's discretion, Maryland's Title III funds were allocated by a formula which gives 75% of available Federal funds to the ten SDAs, with 50% of that pool going to the areas with the most Unemployment Insurance exhaustees and 50% to the areas projected by the state's Department of Employment and Training to have the most dislocated workers. The remaining 25% of the state's Title III funds were assigned to demonstration programs in Western Maryland and the previously described AFL-CIO DEAP program.(26)

Maryland's allocation from the 75% of Federal funds for Title III programs has been approximately $1.7 million a year since 1983, the first year. (Annual comparisons are difficult because time measurement was restructured as part of the transition from CETA to JTPA, resulting in both a Fiscal Year 1984, the nine months October 1983 through June 1984, and a Program Year 1984, July 1984 through June 1985.) In PY 1984

Federal funds were allocated to the ten SDAs as shown in Table 1.

[INSERT TABLE 1: MARYLAND TITLE III ALLOCATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS]

The Governor's Employment and Training Council's (GETC) guidelines stipulate that the monies for each SDA be allocated so that 70% is spent for training, 15% for participant support allowances, and 15% for administrative support, a significant formula. The allocation formula for training and administrative expenditures reflects previous experience with CETA. The lack of restrictions in that law resulted in cases of funds diverted from training to be spent on administration and duplicate efforts, resulting in such new limitations as:

> "Funds provided under the Act shall not be used to duplicate facilities or services available in the area ... unless alternative services or facilities would be more effective or more likely to achieve the service delivery area's performance goals."(27)

The stringent limitations produce improved cooperation among public agencies and SDAs. The new restrictions have forced sharing of efforts among the State Job Service, the public education system, and other public agencies. For example, traditionally non-cooperating SDAs, such as Baltimore City and Baltimore County, are now jointly involved in the closing of a Western Electric plant and contemplating sharing available training program slots at the Eastside Occupational Training Center.

While skills training is often considered a luxury by Title III program participants, such training may also be a luxury for state agencies. Trainees cannot afford the training period, but limited public funds must be spread over many people. SDAs seeking the highest

return on their funds are anxious to limit the amount spent on any one individual. Returning a dislocated worker to paid employment through counseling and job search training is faster and reduces the cost per worker placed, a primary measurement of performance. Thus, the funding and performance environment conspire to emphasize re-employment over skills training.

Performance

The JTPA focuses on placement into unsubsidized employment for all participants. The Secretary of Labor requires governors to establish "an entered employment rate standard" for Title III participants, (28) although governors may vary standards within limits to reflect specific economic geographic and demographic factors unique to their state and its SDAs.

In Maryland seven performance measures have been established for all JTPA programs. In addition to three youth measures (for Title II participants), the four adult measures are: entered employment rate, cost per entered employment, average wage at placement, and welfare entered employment rate.

In FY 1984 Maryland exceeded three of the four adult measures. The only standard not met was the adult "average wage at placement", which fell one cent short of expectations. Unfortunately, the performance reports do not separate disadvantaged from displaced workers, and therefore cannot be evaluated for Title III effectiveness. However, Table 2 demonstrates the magnitude by which actual performance exceeds expectations for three of the adult measures.

[INSERT TABLE 2: COMPARISON OF PERFORMANCE STANDARDS WITH ACTUAL PERFORMANCE]

It is not known exactly how the entered employment rate standard is so precisely computed for each SDA, but some results simply reflect very limited participation. For example Susquehanna's 97.56% "entered employment rate" included only eight Title III terminations. The Upper Shore successfully placed both of its two Title III clients and Prince George's County placed its one program terminee.

The cost for Title III participants entering unsubsidized employment was estimated to be $2746 for Fiscal Year 1984, or $878 per participant (which includes those still in a program).(29) Considering the short time the program has been in effect and the savings in welfare and support payments, this is a reasonable price for the employment of a dislocated worker. However, it is believed that the majority of placements have not been trained for new occupational skills, but simply assisted in re-employment techniques.

Average earnings for dislocated workers are not separated from disadvantaged worker placements, but Title III workers are estimated to earn substantially less than their previous earnings, but above the State's performance objective. "Success" in earnings may be quite different for the state than for the former steel or auto worker. However, the state serves all JTPA clients, including those with no stable employment experience, for whom earning a dollar per hour above the minimum wage may legitmately be called "success".

During the nine months of FY 1984, a total of 1570 individuals

participated in the Title III dislocated workers program across the State. Of these, 761 (about half), terminated their participation, with 502 (66%) of the terminees reported entering unsubsidized employment, and the remaining 259 having been unsuccessful in their efforts, entering the military, or various other reasons.(30)

[INSERT TABLE 3: JTPA TITLE III PLACEMENTS FY 10/1/83 TO 6/30/84 AND FIRST QUARTER FY 1984 7/1/84 TO 9/30/84.]

Caution must be used in interpreting limited first year results. Few participants and start-up difficulties in some areas prohibit any meaningful statistical analysis at this point. Furthermore, the data collection system does not separate re-employment techniques training - the quick fix - from occupational skills training - the longer term solution. The JTPA performance orientation seems to result in higher unsubsidized employment rates than CETA. However, because neither CETA nor any other previous program maintained separate results for dislocated workers, the JTPA results cannot be compared with past policies.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Despite its imperfections, the JTPA seems to do a good job of establishing a partnership of public agencies, employers and labor representatives. It is not clear whether this is due to the structure of the Act, the renewed effort by many state governors and legislators, or the new perception of urgency regarding this issue. The 1982 recession and large scale workforce reductions which spilled into

white-collar jobs including management, created more pressure for today's executives. Higher levels of management are now more active in the decision making process of employment and training policy than under either MDTA or CETA. (31)

From this study it seems that more re-employment training than occupational skills training is being conducted under Title III of the JTPA. Retraining for new skills is a luxury that most of the potential trainees cannot afford. Eligible candidates are making transitions from manufacturing jobs with generous compensation packages to service sector jobs with low wages and limited benefits. Their preference for immediate re-employment rather than six to twelve months of skills training is understandable. However, were the restriction against receiving unemployment benefits to be removed, far more trainees could afford the longer term solution than is now the case. It is strongly urged that this eligibility requirement be deleted for dislocated worker programs.

A dedicated training center such as that in Essex, is ideal for some locations, but not all. It requires large numbers of participants to justify committing substantial funds and expertise for operation. A luxury for many regions, a well situated center can generate better cooperation among SDAs and the various agencies involved in re-employment efforts. In areas where the numbers of disadvantaged workers present a greater urgency than dislocated workers, one training facility may serve the needs of both populations with separate programs. It must be stressed that the psychological needs of the two

groups are quite different and require separate attention.

A statewide coding system for identifying the types of training completed can be initiated with little additional expense. We must know which type of training an individual has received and if employment is related to that training to effectively evaluate any program. Currently, a "placement training relatedness" measurement is planned in Maryland for 1985.(32) Longer skills training negatively affects performance measures such as "cost per entered employment" and it is difficult to contrast longer term sucesses from short term placements, but improved data collection is necessary for better decision making.

Maryland appears to be getting a good return on its investment in Title III programs, although more experience and more detailed results are necessary before a final assessment can be rendered. Spending two or three thousand dollars to place a worker in unsubsidized employment, removing that individual from public assistance, is a cost effective approach for both the state and federal governments.

Why are the statistics so impressive? Have we actually developed a better philosophy and a better structure for our re-employment efforts? Or do the results reflect better designed programs and more efficient operations at the local level? Have the SDAs acquired more experience in operating these programs than when we began with CETA or are they more adept at manipulating data to show better performance results? Do the placement statistics simply reflect the 1983-1984 economic recovery and the availability of low paying service sector jobs? Does limiting the administrative support budget and stimulating cooperative efforts make the difference? These questions are

posed for future research studies.

My original question in undertaking this research was: is Title III of the JTPA successful? If success is defined as placements into unsubsidized unemployment, Maryland is successful. The program is not perfect, but it produces good results and we have nothing better yet. We can only work with what we have now and hope that genuine occupational skills re-training is an objective toward which this nation is willing to work.

TABLE 1

MARYLAND TITLE III ALLOCATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS
Program Year 1984
(July 1, 1984 - June 30, 1985)

SDA	Percent Share *	Amount #
Baltimore Metro.	37%	$643,182
Baltimore County	20%	346,704
Frederick County	2%	42,017
Lower Shore	4%	65,091
Montgomery County	6%	110,971
Prince George's Cty.	10%	175,686
Southern Maryland	3%	50,871
Susquehanna Region	5%	84,999
Upper Shore	3%	50,978
Western Maryland	9%	162,271
Totals	99%	$1,732,770

* Percent share for each SDA is rounded off, totaling less than 100%.

Amount based on 75% of Maryland's Title III allocation for PY 1984. Funds allocated must be matched by the SDA.

SOURCE: Adopted from "Title III Allocations to SDA's, July 1, 1984 - June 30, 1985, issued by Maryland Department of Employment and Training, undated, unnumbered.

TABLE 2
COMPARISON OF PERFORMANCE STANDARDS WITH ACTUAL PERFORMANCE*
FY 1984: Oct. 1 1983 to June 30, 1984

	Entered Emp. Rate		Cost per Entered Emp.		Average Wage at Placement	
	Stnd.	Actl.	Stnd.	Actl.	Stnd.	Actl.
Statewide	54.32	81.46	$4502	$2211	$4.46	$4.45
Baltimore Metro	50.80	88.35	4152	1556	4.34	4.28
Baltimore City	58.51	68.39	4217	3418	4.71	5.01
Frederick	59.01	83.33	3987	3128	4.32	4.37
Lower Shore	46.32	66.29	5156	2777	3.93	4.12
Montgomery	59.72	66.18	3701	6636	4.91	4.82
Prince George's	53.41	62.36	4855	4718	4.64	5.43
Southern Md.	56.97	87.50	5318	1407	4.25	4.36
Susquehanna	59.14	97.56	3134	4086	4.44	4.49
Upper Shore	53.01	73.94	4018	4905	4.02	3.96
Western Md.	57.00	76.23	4809	2687	4.60	4.78

* "Welfare entered employment rate" is not shown because it is designed more for Title IIA than Title III participants.

Source: Maryland Department of Employment and Training, Governors Employment and Training Council Report, Dec. 12, 1984, Section IV.

TABLE 7

JTPA TITLE III PLACEMENTS
FY 10/1/83 TO 6/30/84 AND FIRST QUARTER PY 1984 7/1/84 TO 9/30/84)

SDA	Total Participants	Total Termins.	Unsubsidized Employmt.	Other Termins.
Baltimore Metro.				
FY '84	229	82	61	21
1st Q. PY '84	117	66	65	1
Baltimore County				
FY '84	214	135	114	21
1st Q. PY '84	112	54	40	14
Frederick County				
FY '84	21	14	13	1
1st Q. PY '84	22	0	0	0
Lower Shore				
FY :84	5	0	0	0
1st Q. PY '84	6	3	2	1
Montgomery County				
FY '84	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
1st Q. PY '84	2	0	0	0
Prince George's County				
FY '84	5	1	1	0
1st Q. PY '84	9	0	0	0
Southern Maryland				
FY '84	23	12	11	1
1st Q. PY '84	20	11	4	7
Susquehanna				
FY '84	12	8	8	0
1st Q. PY '84	8	2	1	1
Upper Shore				
FY '84	9	2	2	0
1st Q. PY '84	10	6	3	3
Western Maryland				
FY '84	197	100	87	13
1st Q. PY '84	219	82	69	13

Source: Adapted from Job Training Partnership Act, Title III - Special Report, 10/1/83 to 6/30/84, Maryland DET Reports, Aug. 8, 1984; and First Quarter JTPA Reports, Participation and Terminations Summary for Baltimore County, Baltimore Metro, Frederick, Lower Shore, Montgomery, Prince George's, Southern Maryland, Susquehanna, Upper Shore, Western Maryland, in Marvland Governor's Employment and Training Council Report, Dec. 12, 1984.

FOOTNOTES

1. Karen Spar, Jobs Training Partnership Act: Background and Description, Congressional Research Service Report No. 83-76 EPW, (Washington, D.C.: The Library of Congress, 1983), p. 3.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. A Guide for Communities Facing Major Layoffs or Plant Shutdowns - A Checklist for Community Leaders, Employment and Training Administration, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980), p.26.

5. Spar, op. cit., pp. 4-5.

6. Frank C. Pierson, The Minimum Level of Unemployment and Public Policy, (Kalamazoo, Mich.: The W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, 1980), p. 191.

7. Malcolm R. Lovell, Jr., "An Antidote for Protectionism", The Brookings Review Vol. 3, Fall 1984, p. 24.

8. Maryland Department of Employment and Training, "Coordinating Criteria," paper provided to all Maryland SDAs, June 10, 1983, pp. 1-2.

9. Spar, op.cit., p. 12.

10. "Coordinating Criteria," op. cit., pp. 1-2.

11. Ibid., p. 3.

12. Spar, op. cit., p. 22.

13. Maryland Department of Employment and Training, "Briefing Paper: Public Service T.V. Program - Western Maryland Worker Dislocation," June 11, 1984, p.1.

14. Maryland Department of Employment and Training, "DET Reports - August 8, 1984," (unpublished: hereafter referred to as "DET Reports 8/8/84").

15. Allan Rosenbaum and Barbara Odell, "Interim Report: Dislocated Workers - Profiles of People in Transition" Institute for Policy Analysis and Research, University of Maryland - Baltimore County, Catonsville, Maryland, 1984, pp. 16-17.

16. Ann Edwards, Director, AFL-CIO Appalachian Council Dislocated Employees Assistance Project, interviewed June 12, 1984, Catonsville, Maryland.

17. Vernon Thompson, Assistant Director, Training Operations, Maryland Department of Employment and Training, Job Training and Placement Administration, interviewed June 12, 1984 and January 8, 1985, Baltimore, Maryland.

18. Spar, op. cit., p.22.

19. Ibid., p. 23.

20. Bradley Worker Assistance Center, "A Baltimore Idea...Project Renew", press release, September 1, 1983.

21. Beverly Miller, Director, Renew Project, Bradley Worker Assistance Center, interviewed June 28, 1984, Baltimore, Maryland.

22. Alfred de la Ouesta, Training Coordinator, Bradley Worker Assistance Center, interviewed June 28, 1984, Baltimore, Maryland.

23. Ann Edwards, op. cit.

24. Audrey Theis, Director Eastside Occupational Training Center, interviewed March 14, 1984, Essex, Maryland.

25. Spar, op. cit., p. 22.

26. Vernon Thompson, op. cit.

27. Maryland Department of Employment and Training, "Dislocated Worker Grant Application", Grant Assurances and Certifications, p.20.

28. Daily Labor Report, A-4 (No. 23), Washington, D.C.: Bureau of National Affairs, February 3, 1984.

29. "DET Reports 8/8/84," op. cit., JTPA Title III - Special Report, (unnumbered).

30. "DET Reports 8/8/84," op. cit., Status Report, Job Training Partnership Act, Title III - Special Report, Period: October 1, 1983 to June 30, 1984, (unnumbered).

31. William G. Conroy, Jr., "Human Resource Development - The Private Sector's Role in Public Policy," Sloan Management Review, Fall 1980, pp. 63-70.

32. Frederick Schroeder, Maryland Department of Employment and Training, Monitoring and Evaluation, interviewed January 11, 1984, Baltimore, Maryland.